



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

Applicant	South Tahoe Public Utility District	County	El Dorado
Project Title	STPUD Groundwater Management Plan Revision/Update	Grant Request	\$ 65,612.34
		Total Project Cost	\$ 65,612.34

Project Description: Project revises and updates the current Groundwater Management Plan to bring it into compliance with all pertinent codes and regulations.

Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	3
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	4
Work Plan	8
Budget	5
Schedule	3
QA/QC	5
Past Performance	3
Geographical Balance	0
Total Score	32

- **GWMP or Program:** "The attached Groundwater Applicant states that the plan was adopted on August 17, 2000, and meets CWC Section 10750 et al. Applicant has requested grant funding for a revision of the plan to include the components of SB 1938 and AB 3030. However, the Groundwater Management Plan signature page is actually a resolution of intention to draft a GWMP, thus proof of adoption is lacking. In accordance with the PSP, scoring is based on: 1) applicant not providing evidence of an adopted GWMP; but 2) proposing to complete and adopt a GWMP (updated and SB 1938 compliant) within two years.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** Criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. The proposed project (GWMP update) description is insufficiently detailed. The applicant cites development of groundwater management objectives in certain areas but does not address whether that will result in a plan that is fully compliant or just partially compliant. Applicant otherwise sufficiently addresses this criterion, including demonstrating: both collaboration with others managing the basin (including the Tahoe Sierra IRWM efforts), and the long-term need for and merit of the proposed project.
- **Work Plan:** Criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. A reduced score is based on the following: 1) A discussion on CEQA compliance was not found and is required per the PSP even though it is possible that the project may not be considered a project under CEQA; 2) there is a general lack of strategy presented for "evaluating progress and performance at each step of the proposed project"; and 3) Some tasks are not sufficiently detailed to really understand the work to be undertaken. For instance: Task 7.A- Update Source Water Protection Map (utilizing STPUD GIS system); and Task 8. B- Summarize annual reports on groundwater conditions; compile information into appropriate reporting tools - Applicant provides no additional description, resulting in only a vague understanding of what this task entails. Otherwise, applicant adequately addresses this criterion, including a Work Plan that: is consistent with the budget and schedule; and includes tasks that both reasonably fulfill the objectives of the proposal and relate to improving GW management.



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

- **Budget:** Criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. While estimated costs are provided, including personnel type, hours and rates, there is no basis provided for most of the estimates. Applicant should explain how the estimates were derived, i.e., based on experience with similar projects, contractor quotes, etc... Applicant fully addresses all other required elements of this criterion, including: providing a detailed budget table (that includes labor categories, estimated labor hours, hourly rates, and expenses) that is consistent with and supported by the work plan and schedule.
- **Schedule:** Criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. A reduced score is based on the following: 1) Applicant does not describe a readiness to proceed, as required by PSP (although the timeline is within that specified by the PSP); 2) Applicant does not explain how obstacles would be resolved to keep on schedule. Schedule is consistent with the work plan and budget, appears to include reasonable time frames to complete tasks, and clearly indicates a GWMP adoption within two years of assumed project start date of April 2013, as required by the PSP.
- **QA/QC:** Criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. Applicant demonstrates that appropriate and well-defined QA/QC measures will be implemented for each task, including: assigned professional staff with appropriate qualifications (licensed engineers/hydrogeologists); appropriate review processes (legal review, and outreach that includes review by State and Federal agencies); and the inclusion of appropriate Task item deliverables in order to ensure that each task has been fully implemented.
- **Past Performance:** Criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. A reduced score is based on the following: 1) Although applicant provides several examples of previous and current grant funded projects, of which they indicate (with one exception), were "completed timely and within budget, they do not "provide specific examples of how tasks were completed within time/budget," nor do they provide supporting documentation, as required by the PSP. 2) While applicant notes that a previous LGA grant required "several extensions," no documentation was provided to support whether or not delays were justified as claimed, and no mention of DWR performance evaluations are indicated.